DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 189 981 HE 012 920

AUTHOR Burhorn, John F.
TITLE A Study of Decision Making Responsibility in Small Private Liberal Arts Colleges as Perceived by Selected College Groups.
PUB DATE Apr 80
NOTE 84p.: A dissertation submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy, Walden University.

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC04 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Administrator Responsibility: *Administrator Role: College Administration: College Faculty: College Presidents: Curriculum Development: *Decision Making: Educational Change: Financial Policy: Governance: Government School Relationship: Higher Education: *Liberal Arts: Needs Assessment: *Policy Formation: Program Development: Small Colleges: Student Recruitment: Trustees

ABSTRACT

Decision-making responsibility in small private liberal arts colleges as perceived by faculty, presidents, and trustees is examined in light of the growing pressures of the 1980's on the institutions. Problem areas identified through a literature survey were the acquisition and allocation of financial resources, student recruitment and retention, institutional priorities, institutional purpose, government regulation of the private sector, and program curriculum. A survey instrument was used to test perceptions of problem priorities and problem-solving responsibilities. The questionnaire elicited replies from presidents, trustees, and faculties of some thirty private colleges with student populations less than 2,000. The responses reflected a marked degree of variance between faculty on the one hand and presidents and trustees on the other, with regard to levels of responsibility each share now and should share in the future in four of the seven problem areas. It is concluded that there may be a problem for a greater number of institutions, if the institutions studied can be considered representative of all institutions of their type. The survey is appended and a bibliography provided. (LC)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED189981

ABSTRACT

A STUDY OF DECISION MAKING RESPONSIBILITY IN SMALL PRIVATE LIBERAL ARTS COLLEGES AS PERCEIVED BY SELECTED COLLEGE GROUPS

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

John F. Burhorn

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

By

John F. Burhorn

B.A., Illinois College

M.A., University of Illinois, 1961

Philip Chamberlain

Philip Chamberlain, Ph.D., Advisor
Professor of Education
Indiana University
Bloomington, Indiana

A Dissertation Submitted in Partial Fulfillment of
The Requirements for the Degree of
Doctor of Philosophy

WALDEN UNIVERSITY

April 1980

HE 012 920

© Copyright by John F. Burhorn 1980
All Rights Reserved

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The study which follows would be incomplete without a few words of appreciation to those who helped make it possible. Professor Philip Chamberlain, my research advisor, holds my deepest appreciation for his ability both to keep me working at the project and to restrain my tendency to stray from the dictates of accepted scientific research. For my family, there exists a husband and father's gratitude for sharing a long-held dream, and to daughter Jennifer, an extra thank-you for hours spent collating survey results. I am also in debt to typists Laura Brooke and Vicki Vaughn; to Laura for interpreting my longhand notes, and to Vicki for putting the study together in a manner acceptable to Walden University. And finally, a note of appreciation to Bernard and Rita Turner, whose determination to advance the cause of non-traditional graduate education has made it possible for so many to reach what would be otherwise unattainable goals while making significant contributions to graduate research.

ABSTRACT

Small, private liberal arts colleges in this country appear to be faced with problems in the 1980s which, if they are not resolved, may lead to the demise of a number of those schools. These problems were identified through a literature survey as the acquisition and allocation of financial resources, student recruitment and retention, institutional priorities, institutional purpose, government regulation of the private sector, and program-curriculum. The question was then raised, could these problems be ranked in order of importance for institutional survival? Was there any consensus among college trustees, presidents, and faculty as to responsibility for the solution of those problems in the present and in the future? Was there any difference in perceptions as to solution responsibility in different settings, for example, between an urban-collectivized and a collegial-rural faculty?

A survey-research instrument was included in the study to test perceptions of problem priorities and problem solving responsibility. The questionnaire contained replies from presidents, trustees, and faculties of some thirty private colleges with student populations less than 2,000.

The instrument reflected a marked degree of variance between faculty on the one hand and presidents and trustees on the other, with regard to levels of responsibility each share now and should share in the future in four of the seven

problem areas. The study suggests that there may be a problem for a greater number of institutions, if the institutions studied can be considered representative of all institutions of their type.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS . . . . . .

Chapter

I. INTRODUCTION. 1

The Study Problem 1
The Importance of the Study 1
Background to the Study Problem 8
Purpose of the Study. 18
Procedure 18
Research Hypotheses 21

II. REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE. 22

Acquisition and Allocation of Financial Resources 22
Governance and Management 28
Institutional Identity and Purpose. 31
Planning. 34
Program and Curriculum. 35
Student Recruitment and Retention 37
Government Regulation of the Private Sector . . 40

III. METHODOLOGY 43

Population of the Study 43
Instrument Development. 45
Data Analysis 47

IV. SUMMARY OF FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION. 55

Review. 55
Findings. 58
Discussion. 62

APPENDIX A. 67

BIBLIOGRAPHY. 70

VITA. . . . . .

LIST OF TABLES

1. Analysis of Variance of Problem Area Importance by Group for Present 48
2. Analysis of Variance of Problem Area Importance by Group for Present 50
3. Level of Responsibility for Problem Resolution Present to Future as Perceived by Five Groups. 52

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

The Study Problem

The liberal arts college in the last two decades of the twentieth century will be confronted with problems, some without precedent, which have strong likelihood of changing their historic role and function in American higher education. Many may not survive. Those that endure may do so for a variety of reasons, but one may be their ability to utilize a governance structure and decision-making process in which the responsibilities of individual constituencies, e.g., faculty, board, administration, are clearly identified.

The problem of this study, therefore, was to investigate who was considered responsible for resolving institutional problems both at present and in the future, according to the perceptions of selected trustees, presidents, and faculty in different types of liberal arts college settings.

The Importance of the Study

The small, private liberal arts college is a unique American institution shaped by the opportunities and pressures embedded in the historical experience of this country. Indeed, as Richard Jonsen has pointed out, it was American higher education for more than two centuries until the Morrill Land Grant Act of 1862 brought the state university to the

scene.[1] The early American private college was designed on the model of the English residential college such as Oxford and Cambridge. Most such colleges were founded by religious bodies seeking to preserve and nourish religion through an educated clergy and laity. They were generally elitist in the sense that higher education was considered to be most appropriate for the upper stratum of society.[2] The central purpose espoused by these colleges was the cultivation of the intellect. For over two hundred years, they were designed to be terminal, representing the final stage of one's education. They functioned in loco parentis so as to develop the character as well as the mind of their students. They were prolongers of youth where young people were expected to enjoy four golden years, pick up some knowledge, a patina of culture, and possibly a mate.[3] They were to hand on the learning of the past, and provide social and political leadership for the nation.

The period between the Civil War and World War I introduced considerable change into this educational picture. The elective system was introduced which replaced the entire

---

[1]Richard W. Jonsen, Small Liberal Arts Colleges: Diversity at the Crossroads, ERIC ED154 680 (Washington, D.C.: George Washington University, 1978), p. 3.

[2]Philip C. Chamberlain and Roy B. Shilling, Jr., "Private Liberal Arts Colleges and Their Changing Purposes," Bulletin of the School of Education, Indiana University 43 (May 1967), p. 3.

[3]Society for College and University Planning, The Past, Present and Future of American Higher Education (Washington, D.C.: The Society for College and University Planning, 1978), p. 5.

required system of studies. There was a decided drift toward secularism, and the addition of technical, professional, and advanced studies began to open the door to vocationalism.[1] The private college lost much of its elitist character and became a recognized agent of social mobility. Faculty began demonstrating a growing allegiance to their discipline rather than to the college itself.[2]

Despite these growing strains on the identity and original purpose of the small liberal arts colleges, there remained until the mid-sixties a spirit of collegiality which bound together their lay boards, their presidents, and their faculties. All were reasonably united in their desire to remain small, in their concern for the development of the individual student, and in their regard for a value-oriented education.[3]

Trustees of some small colleges found themselves concerned with fiscal crises from time to time, but the presidents they hired were not primarily fund-raisers, but scholar-administrators whose leadership the trustees seldom challenged. Faculties were concerned with their teaching responsibilities and if there were differences with administrators, they were largely over educational issues and not the general governance of the college which was characterized by strong central management. Students for the most part were wrapped up in inter-fraternity rivalries, athletic events,

---

[1]Chamberlain and Shilling, p. 13.

[2]Ibid., p. 18. [3]Jonsen, p. 5.

and student elections. A general attitude of mutual trust pervaded most campuses.

In the 1950s, the small, private liberal arts college, along with its larger brothers and sisters, enjoyed a period of general prosperity. They experienced growing enrollments for the most part; they continued to build new buildings. Their faculties and staffs grew in size. By the mid-sixties, however, all this began to change. By 1973, Bardwell Smith correctly observed that the older and more traditional forms of governance and communication, so dependent upon a consensus of shared values, had broken down.[1]

As the 1970s drew to a close, the problems which contributed to this breakdown of consensus had not lessened, and the 1980s threatened the very existence of a large number of small, private liberal arts colleges. Inflation had so increased the cost of maintenance, security, student services, and instruction as to necessitate raises in tuition that were driving more and more students to less expensive public institutions. Salaries of faculties and staff were not keeping pace with inflation. The student demonstrations of the Vietnam era had tended, at least for a while, to disenchant the more conservative donors to private colleges. Fluctuations of the stock market had reduced the income from foundation securities and college endowments. More and more young people were coming to question the fiscal rewards of a college education and the value of a classic liberal arts education. If this was not

---

[1]Bardwell L. Smith, The Tenure Debate (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc., 1973), p. 135.

enough, the 1980s promised a shrinking pool of traditional full-time college-age students. The nation was seen moving into what most economists admitted was a period of economic recession.

Fiscal problems overflowed into other areas. Admissions offices on small private college campuses were undergoing pressure to recruit students, and faculty and administration to keep them from dropping out. The admissions offices in turn were pressuring the faculty and administration for new innovative programs and curricula as tools for recruiting. Increasing tension grew between the advocates of the traditional liberal arts curriculum and those advocating a more vocationally oriented curriculum. This in turn led to a growing sense of uncertainty over the educational purpose and identity of the colleges in question. All of the above problems congregated together to place a heavy strain on the decision-making process, that is to say on the role of the trustees, presidents, and faculties in responding to them.

The dilemma was discussed by Martin in Efficient College Management in 1972.[1] Trustees, he observed, were often accused of being concerned exclusively with the fiscal aspects of management, but when they became too interested in purpose and program, they were accused of interfering with faculty prerogatives. Presidents were urged to exercise strong leadership in times of uncertainty, but when they asserted themselves, they were met by calls for the curtailment of

---

[1]William W. Jellema, ed., Efficient College Management (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc., 1972), p. 42.

administrative power.[1] Faculty were experiencing tension between the young and the old, the tenured and the non-tenured, the liberal arts advocates and the career advocates.[2] There was a real danger, according to Martin, that adversarial relationships would replace collegiality and all decision-making would end in a deadlock.[3] The existing crisis called for efficiency in governance, but would the small private liberal arts colleges respond to that call?

In a very real sense, the problem considered by this study became a test of Martin's feeling that efficiency of governancy was seriously threatened by existing conditions. It raised the question: Can the existing decision-making bodies on these small, private liberal arts campuses identify and develop appropriate responses to the problems which confront them?

The problem, however, went one step farther. It was not only a question of whether appropriate responses to small private college problems were being developed, but whether or not there was agreement or disagreement between trustees, presidents, and faculties on each other's and their own present roles and responsibilities in providing that response. Finally, did they agree or disagree on what those roles should be in the future? That this issue was a matter of concern to those affected was borne out by Hodgkinson in 1971.[4] The 1,000-plus college presidents who responded to his survey

---

[1]Ibid., p. 43. [2]Ibid., p. 47. [3]Ibid., p. 51.

[4]Harold L. Hodgkinson, Institutions in Transition (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1971), p. 219.

reported that the largest single category of institutional change in recent years had to do with changes of internal authority and governance structure.

The purpose of the study thus became an effort to answer the question raised in the preceding two paragraphs. First of all, this made it necessary to clearly identify and document the existence of the problems which confronted the colleges. To put it another way, it was important to discover what problems facing small, private liberal arts colleges in the immediate and continuing future were perceived by those knowledgeable in the area of higher education as having the most critical importance for the survival of such colleges.

Second, to answer the question raised by the problem, it was necessary to determine what trustees, presidents, and faculties perceived as their own and each other's role in presently responding to the critical problems identified by the study. Finally, it was necessary to determine perceptions with regard to who should be responsible for responding to the identified problems in the future. Conceivably, there would exist great perceptual differences, some perceptual differences, or little perceptual differences regarding governance roles in the present and/or in the future.

Whether it was proved eventually that existing decision-making bodies could or could not identify and develop appropriate responses to the problems facing the small, private liberal arts colleges and whether there would be or would not be perceptual differences concerning roles and responsibilities in providing those responses, the importance of the study still

would exist. It would provide in either case a better understanding of the internal structure of these colleges as they prepared for the coming years of crisis. If institutions of higher learning were to remain viable, much research would continue to be required into how, why, and in what way decision-making was conducted and how it might be improved. It may be that the problems to be faced are so imposing as to defy creative answers, but if there were to be solutions, these solutions would not be reached by a weak, divided, and diffused governance structure. Either Martin was correct in predicting that decision-making was on its way to deadlock or he was wrong. If research proved him wrong, there would be room for reassurance; if he was right, perhaps there still would be time for change. Proceeding from the above discussion of the importance of this study, two basic assumptions emerged:

1. It will be impossible to solve the problems facing small, private liberal arts colleges in the 1980s and beyond, if those problems are not clearly defined and accepted as problems by faculty and administration

2. It will be impossible to solve these problems if the solutions are undertaken by a weak, diffused, and divided governance structure within which there is minimal common agreement as to who is presently responsible and responsible in the future for the necessary solutions

Background to the Study Problem

Since a major portion of this study focused on decision-making bodies within a liberal arts college setting

and on who should be making decisions, the whole question of patterns or styles of campus decision-making was raised. According to the scholars, what theories of governance best explained how decisions were made in academia? One may use an inductive or a deductive approach to the discussion of academic governance theory. The first analyzes existing governance practices on college or university campuses and develops therefrom a theory to explain what is happening. The second starts with certain basic assumptions about how governance ought to occur, and then seeks to bend what is to what ought to be. In the former, theory develops from practice; in the latter, practice hopefully is influenced by theory. While it may be valuable to view governance from both an inductive and a deductive perspective as Richardson suggested in his article on governance theory, the approach of the study to the theory and practice of governance was largely inductive and descriptive and concerned with theory that explained what existed, not what ought to be.[1] Insofar as governance theory was to prove valuable to this study at all, it was as it supplied a framework through which to interpret the data which the study produced.

In search of this framework, Baldridge in Academic Governance compared the more traditional bureaucratic and

---

[1]Richard C. Richardson, Jr., "Governance Theory: A Comparison of Approaches," Journal of Higher Education 45 (May 1974):344-54.

[2]J. Victor Baldridge, ed., Academic Governance (Berkeley, Calif.: McCutcheon Publishing Corp., 1971), p. 15.

collegial theories on models of governance with his own political model. The application of the bureaucratic model received most detailed explication in Herbert Stroup's Bureaucracy in Higher Education.[1] Insofar as the model applies to the day-to-day administrative tasks of administrators whose place in the academic hierarchy, status, and authority are clearly defined, it continues to be helpful, especially in the case of large, complex university structures. Under this model, conflict is to be controlled by bureaucratic sanctions, and decision-making occurs through formal bureaucratic procedures. Change processes are a matter of minor concern.

When, however, the whole college or university constituency is considered from the standpoint of governance theory and not simply day-to-day administrative decisions, when it becomes a matter of policy formulation, not merely its execution, the bureaucratic model suffers. In the last ten years, there have been limits imposed upon the authority exercised by administrators through student activism and collective bargaining legislation. Still, while Baldridge stated that the bureaucratic model is not useful as a device for analyzing conflicts and power struggles in academia, he did not say that it is totally invalid as a theory of college governance.[2] Indeed, as Rourke and Brooks pointed out in The Managerial Revolution in Higher Education, to keep up with administrators,

---

[1]Herbert Stroup, Bureaucracy in Higher Education (New York: The Free Press, 1966), pp. 15-16.

[2]Baldridge, p. 20.

faculty must modernize their decision-making procedures to cope with the bureaucratic power emerging from the use of institutional research and the computer.[1] Given the current financial problems faced by most colleges and universities, there appears to be a need for strong and responsible central management along the lines of the bureaucratic model.

A second traditional model is that of the collegium or community of scholars. Corson's Governance of Colleges and Universities and Millett's The Academic Community: An Essay on Organization written in the early 1960s seemed at the time to say everything that was really important about college governance, but as Richardson pointed out, although their concept of the college as a collegium was to remain dominant for a decade, the model, like the bureaucratic, would soon be suffering from the dysfunction of change.[2]

The collegial model, as Baldridge called it, views conflict among campus constituencies as abnormal. Such conflicts, when they do occur, are to be overcome by a united community of scholars. Decision-making is shared by faculty, administration, and students. Faculty consider themselves as professionals governed by certain clearly delineated standards of conduct vis-a-vis students and administration. Richardson

---

[1]Francis E. Rourke and Glenn E. Brooks, The Managerial Revolution in Higher Education (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press, 1966), p. 16.

[2]John J. Corson, Governance of Colleges and Universities (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1960), p. 34; John D. Millett, The Academic Community: An Essay on Organization (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1962), p. 10; and Richardson, p. 117.

pointed out that there are two versions of the collegial model. One, the separate jurisdictions approach, assumes that faculty, administration, and students are each concerned about different issues and respect the boundaries between the jurisdictions of other constituencies. Full discussion of this version of the collegial model was developed by Platt and Parsons in a chapter of The State of the University, Authority, and Change published in 1968.[1] The most recent version emphasizes joint participation in decision-making across jurisdictional boundaries and incorporates Keeton's concepts of shared authority.[2]

As in the case of the bureaucratic model, collective bargaining and student activism have taken their toll of collegiality. The model does not prove well suited for resolving serious conflict or the exercise of sanctions deemed necessary if people do not behave as the model dictates. Richardson, however, pointed out that the model need be abandoned only if conflict remains the dominant mode of relationships within institutions of higher education:

> Given the absence of serious conflict, or given its absence in specified areas, the collegial model is a much more attractive way of handling internal relationships because of the assumptions it makes about people and the influence these assumptions have on human behavior.[3]

---

[1]Gerald M. Platt and Talcott Parsons, "Decision-Making in the Academic System: Influence and Power Exchange," in The State of the University, Authority and Change, eds. Carol E. Krytbosch and Sheldon E. Messinger (Beverly Hills, Calif.: Sage Publications, 1968), p. 42.

[2]Morris Keaton, Shared Authority on Campus (Washington, D.C.: American Association for Higher Education, 1971), p. 104.

[3]Richardson, p. 117.

Baldridge, as indicated, set forth the most recent governance model, the political. Obviously, he felt it best describes what is actually going on on college and university campuses. In the political model, change procedures are a matter of primary concern to all constituencies and conflict is viewed as normal. The campus is characterizied by conflicting interest groups and decision-making is achieved through negotiation, bargaining, and political influence processes.[1] Or, as Richardson put it, the decision-making process is diffused and occurs throughout the organization depending on the nature of the issue, the interested groups, and the level of conflict. Focus is on conflict resolution. Because of recent developments, the political model, with its explanation and acceptance of collective bargaining, seems to be gathering support, but it should be noted that what colleges are perceived to be is not always what people feel they should be and thus the other two models are still important. Not every college or university is experiencing or will experience conflict, according to Richardson.[2]

Furthermore, this model casts the college president and his chief administrators solely in the role of fire-fighters whose principal task is to react to contending political pressures from outside and within the institution in such a way as to keep the institution from falling apart on a day-to-day basis rather than leaders who set the course of the institution as creators, not simply reactors to events.

---

[1]Baldridge, p. 15. [2]Richardson, p. 118.

Two observations of Richardson should perhaps be shared in concluding this section on theories of college governance. He observed:

1. That today there is nothing that can properly be regarded as an accepted theory of college governance

2. A college in its entirety is really none of the models discussed, and it is all of them[1]

The three models are in no way mutually exclusive. Viewed as complementary, rather than conflicting, it is obvious that the three together add substantially to one's knowledge of academic governance and how it may function most effectively given a specific set of external circumstances. Indeed, recent research tends to substantiate this view. Childers suggested that the difference among the models may not be of kind, but of their being different points on a spectrum of one college governance model.[2]

Given the theoretical framework explicated in the preceding paragraphs, it was decided to identify two groups of decision-makers whose general decision-making patterns approximated that framework. College A and College B were selected and their entire faculties, as well as the president and one trustee from each institution, were polled. While both colleges exhibited some of the bureaucratic model in their governance procedures, the study identified College A as a college in which the political model dominated, and College B

---

[1] Ibid., p. 119.

[2] Marie E. Childers, "Academic Decision-Making Structures," (Ph.D. dissertation, Indiana University, 1964), p. 43.

as a college in which the collegial model of governance was predominant. Thus, no further effort was made to flesh out the bureaucratic model. It should also be noted that a further consideration of governance as a problem facing the colleges in the 1980s was developed in Chapter II of the study.

College A, designated as urban-collectivized, is located in a small city of 60,000. There are several large industries and a number of smaller ones in the community. The college realizes over $100,000 a year from community businesses and industries. The study body is around 1,000. The faculty, 65 percent tenured, consists of 35 full-time and approximately 12 part-time instructors. Salaries are near the median for private colleges in the state. While some faculty of long service are devoted to the college, loyalties to department and divisions are often stronger. In addition, more than half the faculty are dues-paying members of a national union organization. The union has been on the campus since the early 1970s. Four separate contracts have been negotiated for a three-year period. One of these contracts, the third in the sequence, was not concluded until the faculty threatened to strike and the services of a federal mediator had been used.

A number of faculty after 1970 were released due to financial stringencies, including two tenured professors--one of whom chose to sue the college. Relations between faculty and administration were strained through most of the 1970s. The dean of the college was censured by the faculty

and subsequently resigned in 1975. Relations improved with a new dean and the signing of a three-year contract, but the adversarial environment still clings to the campus to a certain extent.

The annual budget is around $3,500,000. The college is church-related but does not receive a large amount of support from the church. The exact percentage of the college revenue obtained from non-tuition sources is not known, but it is considerably lower than that of College B.

The college is administered by a university administrative cabinet consisting of the president as chairman, the business manager, the director of student services, the academic dean, and the dean of the seminary, which, together with the college, constitutes the university. There are four divisions and a number of academic departments. The four division chairmen, plus four students and four faculty members, serve on the educational policies committee chaired by the academic dean. During the early 1970s, the college operated in the red, but in 1977-78, it balanced its budget and by 1978-79, had only a slight deficit. Enrollment rose after 1975 through 1979 with the introduction of several new innovative majors and degree programs. Endowment at College A is around $5,000,000 as compared with $3,000,000 at College B.

For the most part, College A fits the political model. Change is a matter of great concern and conflict has characterized much of the recent history of the college. Due to collective bargaining, many governance decisions are made through negotiation and bargaining. Even when outright

bargaining is not underway, the political influence process is still at work.

College B, designated as rural-collegial, is located in a town of 6,000 population. There are a few small local industries, but the area is primarily agricultural. The student body is slightly under 600. The faculty, over 60 percent tenured, consists of 25 full-time and 11 part-time instructors. Salaries are the lowest of any private college in the state. Most of the faculty are devoted to the college and the community, and there is very little mobility in or out of the institution. The annual budget is a little over $2,000,000, and 70 percent of the college revenue comes from non-tuition sources. The college is church-related and receives a good share of financial support from individual congregations.

The college is administered by a college administrative council consisting of the president as chairman, the business manager, the director of college relations, the academic dean, and the dean of students. There are no academic departments but rather divisions, five in number, whose chairmen constitute the academic council, which also has one student representative and the academic dean as chairman of the council. In recent years, the college has operated with balanced budgets largely due to its fund-raising efforts. Enrollment, however, has been declining since 1976 and endowment produced only 7 percent of total revenue.

While there are occasional differences between faculty and administration, and while administration has often operated

in an authoritarian manner, a general attitude of trust in administrative leadership seems to pervade the campus. This attitude was strengthened by the arrival in 1979 of a new president who immediately began to involve faculty in governance responsibilities which they had not exercised in recent years. There is no faculty senate and no faculty organization other than the faculty itself which meets twice a month.

In most cases, College B fits Baldridge's delineation of the collegial model. Conflict among campus constituencies is considered as abnormal since much emphasis is placed on the college "family." Decision-making, except for a brief period from 1975 to 1979, has been shared. There has been no movement in the direction of collective bargaining and regulations regarding contract renewal, promotion and tenure are not the subject of controversy.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was threefold: (1) to identify the critical problems confronting private liberal arts colleges, (2) to select groups of trustees, presidents, and faculty representative of different liberal arts college governance settings, and (3) to compare and contrast their perceptions of the importance of these problems, both present and future, and also which groups had responsibility for their resolution.

Procedure

The first part of this study involved the identification and discussion of the critical issues confronting higher

educational institutions and particularly private liberal arts colleges. The procedure used to accomplish this was a review of the literature judged relevant to the topic. Several possibilities existed to determine what might be considered relevant. They ranged from establishing a list developed by a panel of experts to a general survey of what had been written on the topic appearing in the various library catalog systems. Neither approach was used as the first approach was seen to be restricted potentially to the literature produced only by the experts, and the second suffered from providing few boundaries. The approach used to establish the necessary literature base was a combination of the two. Several recognized experts in higher education were asked to suggest works that should be considered as base line. From these works, a listing of other readings was developed which explored subject fields tangential to the topic. This approach was followed until it appeared that references listed in the individual works reached a boundary of redundancy. In this manner, some one hundred possible works were identified as the universe of information from which some thirty were selected for primary review. This review with the resultant identified critical issues is presented in Chapter II.

The second step in this study was to select groups of trustees, presidents, and faculty considered representative of different liberal arts college settings. Liberal arts colleges by definition are institutionalized communities, communities characterized as possessing common goals, shared values, norm referenced behavior, and equal amounts of trust

and reciprocity. Despite this description, it is possible that these elements (and others which constitute institutional organizations) may exist in different degrees of development, and thus the nature of these communities may differ by places and by time perspective. One premise of this study, as discussed in the previous section, was that differences in governance and decision-making structures among institutions may not be one of kind, but of variations within the same structure. On the further assumption that these variations may affect perceptions of decision-making responsibility, it was decided that groups for this study should be representative of what was considered three extremes of one kind: (1) an urban-collectivized liberal arts college (College A); (2) a rural collegial liberal arts college (College B); and (3) a composite institution composed of a trustee, a president, and a faculty member from each of a pre-determined number of liberal arts colleges.

In this manner, groups could be used for comparison representing distinct variations of the governance structure typically associated with liberal arts colleges. It was felt that these groups would provide additional insight into differences, if found, in perceptions of responsibility for problem-solving. The construction of these groups is discussed in Chapter III.

Step three of this study involved comparing the actual perceptions of the trustee, president, and faculty groups concerning the decision-making responsibility for the identified problems. This was done by means of a survey instrument with

the collected data treated by appropriate statistical methods.

The content of the instrument was derived from the discussion of critical problems presented in Chapter II. The procedure for developing the instrument and the analysis of the data is also presented in Chapter III.

The total study can be described as descriptive survey research.

Research Hypotheses

The research hypotheses for this study were posed as follows:

1. There would be no significant difference in the relative importance of critical problems at present as perceived by groups of trustees, presidents, and faculty

2. There would be no significant difference in the relative importance of critical problems in the future as perceived by groups of trustees, presidents, and faculty

3. There would be no significant difference in the level of responsibility for problem resolution present and future as perceived by groups of trustees, presidents, and faculty

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

The purpose of the literature survey that follows was to review the extant literature relating to problems faced by small, private liberal arts colleges. The sources from which the literature was derived included books and periodical articles from the libraries of the University of Dubuque and the University of Arkansas and ERIC documents obtained on microfiche from the University of Arkansas. These sources produced over a hundred possible citations from which thirty primary works were identified. These thirty works were selected on the basis of the following criteria: (1) currency of the work, (2) specificity of the discussion in its relation to the topic of the research, (3) the authoritativeness of the observations. An initial review of various sources produced seven problem topics for critical examination. The following discussion is organized according to these topics.

Acquisition and Allocation of Financial Resources

Harold L. Hodgkinson reported on the response of a thousand or so college presidents to the question, "What major problems that you are currently facing are of most concern to you?" The number one response was "financing the

college program."[1] In this same report, it was revealed that more and more colleges were relying on federal funding, much of which might or might not be renewed on a yearly basis at the whim of the Congress and the administrative agencies. William Jellema observed that there was a need for better fiscal management and cost-cutting procedures at most private colleges.[2]

Alexander Astin and Calvin Lee co-authored The Invisible Colleges in 1972. The book dealt with the plight of small private colleges as they saw it. They found that, with respect to financial resources, these colleges were in a dismal position.[3] Less revenue from virtually all sources was received than by what the writers called the elite or middle colleges. Funds were lacking for both faculty salaries and financial aid. Endowments were small. Astin and Lee concluded that a major new infusion of money was a necessity. Jellema spelled out the situation in more detail.[4] Small private colleges were the victims of inflation that led to rising costs for campus security, student services, instruction, and maintenance. At the same time, Jellema noted a declining rate of enrollment partly due to a widening tuition gap between

---

[1]Hodgkinson, p. 23.

[2]William W. Jellema, ed., Institutional Priorities and Management Objectives (Washington, D.C.: The American Association of Colleges, 1971), p. 145.

[3]Alexander W. Astin and Calvin B. T. Lee, The Invisible Colleges (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1972), p. 47.

[4]Jellema, Efficient College Management, p. 107.

public and private higher education. The colleges that Jellema studied were in debt for 26 percent of the book value of their physical plants.[1]

In 1972, Jenny and Wynn presented an even more dismal picture than Astin, Lee, and Jellema.[2] Long-term, per-student costs had escalated and income and income prospects had fallen off. Deficits were on the increase. Twenty-three of the forty-eight colleges studied showed deficits in excess of $50,000.[3] The authors accused the private colleges of poor business practices; for example, in the area of plant renovation. One might say in conclusion that the problem of the acquisition and allocation of financial resources had become acute in the early 1970s.

Another peek at the situation was given two years later in Carol Schulman's Private Colleges, Present Conditions and Future Prospects. In this book, there was further talk about cost escalation and inflation. Added to this was less tuition income due to declining enrollments.[4] Tenure practices were preventing the limiting or closing of programs that were in deficit. Apparently, according to Schulman, 1974 and the preceding year had seen noble efforts to hold down expenditures

---

[1]Ibid., p. 117.

[2]Hans H. Jenny and G. Richard Wynn, The Turning Point: A Study of Income and Expenditure Growth and Distribution of 48 Private Four-Year Colleges, 1960-1970, ERIC ED 065 019 (Wooster, Mass.: College of Wooster, 1972), p. 3.

[3]Ibid., p. 6.

[4]Carol Schulman, Private Colleges, Present Conditions and Future Prospects, ERIC ED 098 888 (Washington, D.C.: George Washington University, 1974), p. 12.

and cut costs, but she concluded: "While these methods have been effective in weathering a particular crisis, it is questionable whether they offer long-range solutions."[1] Expenditures would have to be held down indefinitely for salary and maintenance, and this threatened the quality of education in the small private colleges.[2]

In 1975, the Carnegie Council for the Advancement of Teaching published More Than Survival, in which it was reported that faculty salaries were not keeping up with the cost of living.[3] At the same time, Trivett reported that small private colleges were concentrating on cost-cutting and tuition increases, both of which had their limits.[4]

Kershaw in The Very Small College reported a slackening of the growth of the pool of college students and predicted that the growth would stop altogether in the near future with a negative effect on tuition income.[5] At the same time, he noted that individuals and foundations were retrenching in their giving to colleges and that inflation was rampant, with an unbelievable jump in the price of fuel oil as an example.[6]

---

[1]Ibid., p. 42. [2]Ibid., p. 43.

[3]Carnegie Council for the Advancement of Teaching, More Than Survival (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc., 1975), p. 1.

[4]David A. Trivett, The Vital Small College, ERIC ED 114 004 (Washington, D.C.: George Washington University, 1975), p. 1.

[5]Joseph A. Kershaw, The Very Small College: A Report to the Ford Foundation, ERIC ED 148 205 (New York: The Ford Foundation, 1976), p. 8.

[6]Ibid., p. 8.

Deficits were reported as high as 10 percent of educational and general income. The costs of financial aid had risen and there were little funds for professional development of faculty.[1] In the same year, Andrew and Freedman produced a very interesting study of the demise or merger of ten small private colleges. Public institutions, they pointed out, were in a better position to recruit students and money.[2] They spoke of inflation, limited private giving, and faltering endowment income.[3] In the case of the ten colleges, their financial base was simply insufficient to support the mission of the school.[4]

Minter and Bowen in Independent Higher Education provided the first sign of hope in this dismal picture.[5] Their NAICU interviews of 135 colleges revealed that 50 percent of the college presidents questioned believed their colleges were gaining financial ground and another 42 percent felt they were holding their own. As to the next five years, 30 percent of the presidents felt their institutions would improve substantially, while 65 percent felt they would improve a little.[6]

---

[1]Ibid., p. 14.

[2]Loyd D. Andrew and Burton D. Freedman, A Study of the Causes for the Demise of Certain Small Liberal Arts Colleges in the U.S., ERIC ED 125 486 (Blacksburg: Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University, 1976), p. 11.

[3]Ibid. [4]Ibid., p. 16.

[5]W. John Minter and Howard R. Bowen, Independent Higher Education, Fourth Annual Report on Financial and Educational Trends in the Independent Sector of American Higher Education, ERIC ED 158 653 (Washington, D.C.: National Association of Independent Colleges and Universities, 1978), p. 43.

[6]Ibid., p. 45.

Frankly, however, there is little in the remainder of the Minter-Bowen report to sustain the presidential optimism, particularly in the category classified by the authors as Liberal Arts II colleges.[1]

Gifts and endowments in these colleges had not kept pace with rising costs. The number of administrators and general service employees had risen substantially, adding to the overhead.[2] Yet, at the same time, the small college's competitive position in the labor market was deteriorating. In 1978, survival still depended, among other things, on the capacity to raise larger and larger amounts of money, and Minter and Bowen spoke of the "delicate financial stability" of the small, private liberal arts college.[3]

The authors concluded that slow and inexorable using up of capital made the status of the colleges as good as it appeared to be, but the future seemed to promise the continued drawing down of reserves, using for current operations gifts that should go into endowment, neglect of maintenance, and inability to keep faculty and staff salaries growing with regard to the national labor force.[4] Jonsen also confirmed much of what Minter and Bowen said:

> Thus as demographic conditions become more difficult for higher education, the relative ability of small institutions to compete for students, dollars, and public attention will certainly decline.[5]

---

[1]Ibid., p. 99. [2]Ibid., p. 28.

[3]Ibid., p. 91. [4]Ibid., p. 111.

[5]Jonsen, p. 19.

In the literature reviewed, no item was discussed more thoroughly or more often than that of the acquisition and allocation of financial resources. Toward the end of the 1970s, largely through cost-cutting procedures, a number of colleges had reached a sort of delicate stability, but the problem of financial resources was still very real, according to the writers who assessed the situation in 1978. Inflation had led to the continued raising of tuition which further evidenced the gap between the cost of attending a private instead of a public institution. Endowment and other forms of giving had not kept pace with inflation. Demographic conditions did not look promising. Maintenance was being neglected. There was a limit to the benefits that could be gained by cost-cutting, and the quality of programs affected by cuts was in question. Noble efforts had been made to deal with the problem, but the 1980s offered an uncertain future.

Governance and Management

When Hodgkinson asked his thousand presidents what they felt was the most significant event in their institution's recent past, the largest number of replies had to do with changes of internal authority and governance structure.[1] In almost every instance, the presidents reported an increase in student and faculty authority and a decrease in the authority of the central administration.[2] McGee, in his book Academic Janus, discussed what he considered increasing tensions over

---

[1]Hodgkinson, p. 219.

[2]Ibid., p. 221.

policy and authority between faculty, administrators, and board members.[1]

George Wethersby in Institutional Priorities and Management Objectives, pointed out that leadership is knowing where to go, while management is knowing how to get there. He concluded that all our emphasis had been on management of the college scene when the foremost need was "for a sense of direction from which the light might shine, if it were, mind you, ever to shine again."[2]

Jellema edited another book in 1972 in which Warren B. Martin went so far as to ask in what sense anyone did govern the college.[3] Frederick Ness, in the same book, raised an issue which deserves to be quoted in its full context:

> At the moment we know far too little about the changing patterns of governance on either the formal or informal level. What is clear, however, is that governance patterns have serious implications for the fiscal health of an institution . . . the greater question remains, however, whether our institutions can survive through a period of financial crisis without a strong and responsible central management. The odds would seem to be all in the other direction.[4]

Bardwell Smith and his associates in The Tenure Debate observed that the older and more traditional forms of governance, so dependent upon a consensus of shared values, had

---

[1]Reece McGee, Academic Janus (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc., 1971), p. 43.

[2]Jellema, Institutional Priorities, p. 211.

[3]Jellema, Efficient College Management, p. 37.

[4]Ibid., p. 51.

broken down.[1] The revamping of governance structures in the late 1960s and early 1970s was not in Smith's opinion always successful. He raised the issue of the rise of unionism and its effect on governance.

The Carnegie Council reported that declining enrollment growth was creating authority struggles.[2] The Council further stated that, although decentralized forms of governance were highly effective in growth periods, in periods of decline they were more likely to paralyze the organization.[3] Trivett, for his part, spoke of the need for better management of small private colleges.[4]

The Society for College and University Planning observed that over a ten-year period, there had been a parade of solutions to the problems of governance in higher education, including all sorts of management systems borrowed from business and industry.[5] The Society concluded that such solutions had really not succeeded all that well. Minter and Bowen stated that the commitment and quality of leadership was an intangible asset for the strength and survival of small liberal arts colleges.[6]

---

[1]Smith, p. 135.

[2]Carnegie Council, p. 14.

[3]Ibid., p. 87.

[4]Trivett, p. 3.

[5]Society, p. ix.

[6]Minter and Bowen, p. 90.

Cleary, in an article appearing in the Educational Record, reported that the authority relation between college presidents and trustees was so unclear that maximum joint effort was required to insure the success of that relation.[1] To return to 1971 for a moment, Eldon Johnson really put the capstone on the governance problem as faced in the 1970s by the small private colleges when he observed: "In the college's circulatory system, infinite and interminable talk becomes a coagulent which produces embolism and, eventually, paralysis."[2]

This section was concluded with a quote about interminable talk because it was indicative in a summary fashion of the whole governance problem at the approach of the 1980s. By 1979, governance roles had become sufficiently confused on the small private college campus that there was little left to do but talk. This was probably not true in all cases, but the literature reviewed indicated that it was frequently true. Wider participation in governance and the rise of unionism, or at least the wage-earner attitude on the part of faculty, made and continues to make the kind of leadership necessary to meet fiscal crises difficult to effect.

Institutional Identity and Purpose

The item in question appeared a number of times in the literature after 1970, but included in the survey was one article from the 1960s because it proved to be prophetic.

---

[1]Robert E. Cleary, "Trustee-President Authority Relations," Educational Record 60 (Spring 1979):157.

[2]Eldon Johnson, From Riot to Reason (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1971), p. 73.

In 1967, Chamberlain and Shilling made an observation which was repeated in the later literature.[1] They emphasized that for the private liberal arts college, there was a crisis of identity which, if not solved, might well threaten, if not change forever, the traditional function of these colleges in providing freedom of choice and diversity of educational opportunity.[2] They indicated that the dichotomy between liberal and vocational preparation on the private college campus had to be resolved. At least one source in the 1970s made a great point of this latter observation, and the researcher's own personal experience as an academic dean on a private college campus in the 1970s bears it out.

In Jellema's Efficient College Management, Martin asserted that higher education did not have a sufficiently keen sense of purpose:

> Since administration and faculty can no longer speak with confidence or consensus about the assumptions or values behind educational programs, they talk about quantifiable details, existing practices, and procedural innovations.[3]

He went on to observe that there was no agreement on educational philosophy, methods of teaching, and methods of learning except that there was no best way.

In 1974, Schulman stated that there were very real differences over what constituted higher education on the private college campus.[4] Institutions were having trouble

---

[1]Chamberlain and Shilling, p. 2. [2]Ibid.

[3]Jellema, Efficient College Management, p. 21.

[4]Schulman, p. 13.

developing a distinctive character and several colleges had folded while trying to change their image.

The Carnegie Commission on Higher Education spoke of inconsistent and ill-defined purposes on small, private liberal arts campuses, operation by trial and error, and invention born of necessity.[1] The Commission said many colleges simply do not know what they are doing.

Andrew and Freedman, in their study of ten colleges that failed, found that six of the ten suffered from serious confusion and conflict among their constituencies regarding purpose, mission, and value orientation.[2]

Jonsen indicated that there was a real crisis of purpose and pleaded for the integration of the liberal arts with the vocational programs that many colleges had adopted.[3] Thus, it would appear that the 1970s have not brought a solution to the identity-purpose problem any more than they have to the acquisition and allocation of financial resources and governance/management problems.

The principal problem cited by the literature was the dichotomy of the liberal arts and career entry emphases. Though the literature did not mention it, another problem might be that the public institutions have taken over so many of the traditional functions of the small, private liberal arts

---

[1]Carnegie Commission on Higher Education, Sponsored Research of the Carnegie Commission on Higher Education (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1975), p. 266.

[2]Andrew and Freedman, p. 15.

[3]Jonsen, p. 29.

college. The problems raised by confusion in governance and the need to raise more and more money and recruit harder and harder for new students may also have contributed to the problems in terms of achieving a consensus by trustees, faculty, and administration over the purpose of their respective institutions.

Planning

James L. Hayes wrote a chapter in Jellema's Institutional Priorities and Management Objectives in which he stated that an improved long-range planning process was a necessity not yet realized on most small, private liberal arts college campuses. The only alternative for a good administration was to become totally authoritarian.[1] When one considered the non-authoritative direction in which governance had moved, even this alternative to planning had been removed.

Trivett indicated that there was a need for improvement in institutional planning.[2] Without such planning, decisions would continue to be made without regard to institutional mission, quality of program, adequacy of resources, or implications for organizational structure.[3]

The Society for College and University Planning discussed the emergence of planning as the supposed answer to college problems.[4] Various management systems had been

---

[1]Jellema, Institutional Priorities, p. 198.

[2]Trivett, p. 2.

[3]Ibid., p. 3.

[4]Society, p. ix.

borrowed by the small private colleges from business, including MBO and PPB.[1] The Society report concluded that such systems had met with mixed success in higher education because of the differences between business and educational enterprises.

As must be realized, references to planning in the literature reviewed for this study were not as plentiful as for other items. Yet, the references that did exist agreed that small private colleges were trying to plan their way out of their problems with mixed success. It may be concluded from this that planning and planned change are difficult to achieve when the problems of governance and identity, plus financial pressures, are operative.

Program and Curriculum

In 1971, Hodgkinson reported that next to governance changes, the second largest category of change reported by college presidents was in the area of academic programs.[2]

Schulman indicated that a very real question for small, private liberal arts colleges was what educational programs should be offered.[3] She went on to assert that liberal arts colleges must secularize their curriculum in order to meet career-oriented demands, provide for more independent study, give credit for learning experiences.[4] She also felt that departments should reduce the number of hours they offer in their major to a minimum required for

---

[1]Ibid. [2]Hodgkinson, p. 220.

[3]Schulman, p. 15. [4]Ibid., p. 24.

graduation. Needless to say, not everyone on the small college campus in 1974 agreed with these conclusions.

Trivett quoted the famous statement by the Commissioner of Higher Education, T. H. Bell, that liberal arts colleges which did not offer their students, saleable, useful skills and knowledge would soon be out of business.[1] He also urged the use of market analysis in connection with the development of new programs.[2]

Minter and Bowen, in their report for the National Association of Independent Colleges and Universities, indicated that students were heavily oriented toward careers.[3] The implication of this fact was developed by Jonsen. Highly structured liberal arts curricula, according to Jonsen, were dead.[4] Additions and expansion of programs exceeded deletions ten to one. Furthermore, departmentalization had resulted in the creation of majors and degree programs regardless of student demand.[5] Upper divisional courses tended to be low in enrollment. Course offerings had been enlarged to meet the needs of faculty specialization. There were very few good interdisciplinary courses. Vocationalism was at odds with the liberal arts image.[6] Jonsen concluded:

> It hardly appears that small liberal arts colleges are moving as a group to become more responsive, modern, career relevant, or imaginative in their curricular structure.[7]

---

[1]Trivett, p. 1. [2]Ibid., p. 3.

[3]Minter and Bowen, p. 33. [4]Jonsen, p. 16.

[5]Ibid. [6]Ibid., p. 17. [7]Ibid., p. 18.

The problem of what to offer in terms of curriculum and program appeared in the literature reviewed to be closely connected with the identity-purpose problem. There did not appear to be any real resolution of the liberal arts versus vocationalism problem or the financial problem caused by the proliferation of courses and programs which, without benefit of market analysis, were proving unprofitable. Like Topsy, curriculum just grew without benefit, in many cases, of any careful planning.

Student Recruitment and Retention

McGee reported that in 1970, 35 percent of all undergraduates were in private institutions. He predicted that by 1980, the figure would be 20 percent.[1] Johnson stated that the very future of the private college hinged upon being able to develop an effective admissions program.[2]

Astin and Lee concluded that the very invisibility of what they defined as the invisible private colleges would present major difficulties in recruiting students.[3] They also reported that there was increasing competition with community and public four-year colleges for students. With rising tuition fees, private colleges might price themselves out of the market. In the same year, Stanley Unibeck in Jellema's Efficient College Management put the private sector's

---

[1]McGee, p. 51.

[2]Jellema, Institutional Priorities, p. 169.

[3]Astin and Lee, p. 65.

share of students in 1980 at 15 percent--or 5 percent lower than McGee.[1]

Schulman indicated that higher tuition continued to narrow the student market, and admissions offices were looking for new recruiting methods.[2] Amidst growing competition for a dwindling market, some colleges had signed recruiting contracts with private organizations.[3] Schulman felt that small private colleges must begin to serve a clearly definable clientele.

The Carnegie Council for the Advancement of Teaching predicted a zero enrollment growth rate in the 1980s and warned against over-optimism resulting from a temporary upsurge in admissions.[4] The leveling of enrollment in the 1980s would last until about 1995.[5] Elsewhere, the Carnegie Commission reported that in 1972, there were a total of 55,200 unfilled freshman places as revealed by 572 private colleges.[6] Trivett quoted L. R. Meeth as warning that new programs to recruit students cost money without guaranteeing results.[7] Furthermore, increasing enrollment served no purpose unless each new student was paying his way in full.

Kershaw reported that five percent of the private liberal arts colleges had student enrollments of less than 750.[8] Andrew and Freedman, in their study of the close or

---

[1]Jellema, Efficient College Management, p. 130.

[2]Schulman, p. 30. [3]Ibid., p. 21.

[4]Carnegie Council, p. 5. [5]Ibid., p. 42.

[6]Carnegie Commission, p. 137.

[7]Trivett, p. 3. [8]Kershaw, p. 4.

merger of ten private liberal arts colleges, asserted that public colleges were better prepared to recruit new students, especially non-traditional students.[1] Over half of the ten colleges that closed or merged had a student enrollment of 500 or less.[2]

The Society for College and University Planning stated that by 1990, there would be 25 percent fewer students in college.[3] Minter and Bowen reported that there was increasing competition from new public institutions as the tuition gap widened.[4] Also, the pool of available students was decreasing. At the moment, it was true that there was a slow upward trend in enrollment in private colleges, but part-time, non-degree numbers were increasing while full-time numbers were on the decline.[5] The rise in the size of admissions staffs indicated that recruitment efforts were increasing more readily than recruitment results. The student retention rate had not improved. They concluded: "The overall enrollment situation remains uncertain, particularly in view of demographic changes due in the 1980s."[6]

One of the intangible assets on which survival for small, private liberal arts colleges depended was the ability to attract students. Jonsen added his voice to the 1978 chorus:

---

[1]Andrew and Freedman, p. 6. [2]Ibid., p. 13.

[3]Society, p. 15. [4]Minter and Bowen, p. 15.

[5]Ibid., p. 8.

[6]Ibid., p. 18.

> Thus, as demographic conditions become more difficult, the relative ability of small institutions to compete for students, dollars, and public attention will certainly decline.[1]

Outside of financial problems, no other item occupied the attention of those writing on private higher education in the 1970s more than the problem of student recruitment and retention. The private sector was confronted by the necessity for raising tuition, while all predictions pointed to a declining student pool and increasing competition with the public sector as well as with each other. There was an upsurge in enrollment in the mid-seventies, but many saw it as an Indian summer phenomenon before the coming winter. Finally, it appeared that recruitment/retention and financial problems were inextricably interwoven.

Government Regulation of the Private Sector

Goldwin, in addressing the annual meeting of the American Association of Presidents of Independent Colleges, raised the question: "Why should there be any doubt about the privacy of private schools and the independence that should follow from it?"[2] He went on to say that there was much doubt given the accountability of private colleges to the government for the expenditure of government funds.

Winkler, in the Chronicle of Higher Education, asked if government had now become the enemy of private higher

---

[1] Jonsen, p. 19.

[2] Robert A. Goldwin, Private Higher Education: The Job Ahead, ERIC ED 126 828 (Rockford, Ill.: American Association of Presidents of Independent Colleges and Universities, 1975), p. 4.

education.[1] She pointed out that it was proving costly to comply with federal regulations that took up one to 4 percent of private college budgets. She examined the government's intrusion with small college governance and administration due to the Buckley law, the Veterans Administration, and affirmative action. Title IX and handicap regulations were added after the Winkler article. In the same year, Jackson quoted Dallin H. Oaks, president of Brigham Young: "Colleges are supinely accepting government control; they have the resources and legal theories to contest."[2]

This problem was included despite the sparsity of citations because what was discovered indicated that it was a growing one. There were arguments in favor of the continuance of private colleges because they contributed to the pluralism of higher education in America, leaving students with an educational choice. It would seem on the basis of the limited evidence here presented that that choice might be threatened if colleges became private in name only.

One of the purposes of this study, as previously stated, was to identify the problems facing private liberal arts colleges in the immediate and continuing future which were perceived to have the most critical importance for their survival. In the literature survey which composed this chapter

---

[1]Karen J. Winkler, "Proliferating Federal Regulations: Is Government Now 'The Enemy'?" Chronicle of Higher Education, December 13, 1976, p. 3.

[2]Robert L. Jackson, "The First Amendment: Refuge for Colleges?" Chronicle of Higher Education, June 28, 1976, p. 10.

of the study, that part of the total purpose has been achieved. The problems have been identified as: (1) the acquisition and allocation of financial resources, (2) governance/management, (3) institutional identity-purpose, (4) planning, (5) program/curriculum, (6) student recruitment/retention, and (7) government regulation of the private sector. Six of these problems with some reformulation composed the body of the survey/research instrument which was prepared to test the perception of college presidents, trustees, and faculty as to the persons responsible in the present and the future for the solution of those problems. One problem, governance/management, was purposely omitted since the entire purpose of the study was to evaluate decision-making responsibilities as they applied to the other six problems. The construction of the instrument containing these problems is presented in the following chapter.

CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

Population of the Study

As described in Chapter I, this study was concerned with the perceived responsibility for institutional response to critical problems by groups of trustees, presidents, and faculty. It also was concerned with whether or not these perceptions might be affected by the particular institutional governance configuration in which these groups were found. For this reason, the governance constructs proposed by Baldridge and discussed further by Richardson were used to select two liberal arts colleges to be used for study. Though similar in type and purpose but differing in decision-making processes, these institutions were labeled urban-collectivized (College A) and rural-collegial (College B). The faculties from each were used as two separate groups for the study.

Recognizing that an institution may be a unique entity and that the particular elements which contribute to its uniqueness may not generalize across other institutional settings, it was decided that a third faculty group would be constructed by using one faculty member from each institution making up a set of liberal arts colleges similar in purpose and size to College A and College B. The number of these colleges was approximate to the number of faculty members in both

College A and College B. This composite faculty was used in the study as a standard against which the perceptions of problem responsibility of the other two faculty groups could be compared.

The fourth group in the study was made up of the presidents of all the institutions involved. A fifth and final group was composed of the chairmen of the boards of trustees of the same institutions. These two groups with the three faculty groups comprised the sample for the study.

The institutions asked to participate were all private, church-related liberal arts colleges with enrollments less than 2,000. Initially, it was hoped that the Presbyterian colleges in the United States of the designated size would comprise the population. The response from the invitation to participate in the study, however, required the later inclusion of ten additional colleges to the population that were not affiliated with the Presbyterian Church. These colleges, affiliated with other churches, were selected to approximate the institutions wishing to be excluded from the study. In this manner, forty-five institutions, in addition to College A and College B, were asked to participate; thirty accepted the invitation. The study population included the groups as follows:

1. Group A: Faculty of College A
2. Group B: Faculty of College B
3. Group C: Composite faculty, one each from thirty institutions
4. Group P: Presidents from surveyed institutions, including presidents from College A and College B

5. Group T: Chairmen of boards of trustees from surveyed institutions, plus trustees from College A and College B

The data collected for this study were analyzed according to possible interactions among the groups as follows:

Group Interaction

A - B
A - C
A - P
A - T

B - C
B - P
B - T

C - P
C - T

P - T

and

A + B - C
A + B - P
A + C - T

and

A + B + C - P
A + B + C - T

Instrument Development

The data collection instrument employed in this study had for its content the seven critical problems, modified as indicated, that are identified in the literature review in Chapter II. In this way, it was assumed to have content validity. The instrument consisted of three parts. Part I listed the critical problems and instructed the respondent to rank order them by importance as perceived presently. The respondent was also asked to rank order them again by order

of importance as perceived in the future.

Part II of the instrument instructed the respondent to indicate the level of responsibility, using a five-point Likert scale, which trustees, presidents, and faculty are perceived to have for resolving each of the seven critical problems. The respondent was instructed to indicate the level of responsibility perceived at present and in the future.

Part II was made up of items asking for demographic information from the respondents. This information was used for descriptive purposes only.

The constructed instrument was given to a panel of experienced college administrators to determine its usefulness (reliability). They were asked to react to its design, format, and language. Modifications in the instrument were made where appropriate.

In addition, following the collection of the study data, a Spearman-Brown split half, reliability test was applied. A correlation coefficient of .84 was found. These tests for reliability led to the conclusion that the instrument was appropriate for the study. A copy of the finished instrument is contained in Appendix A.

The instrument was sent to all members of the faculties of College A and College B. It was also sent to the chairman of the faculty senate (or its equivalent), the president, and the chairman of the board of trustees of each of the thirty participating institutions. A follow-up mailing was sent to non-respondents two weeks after the initial mailing. The final useable responses for each group of the study were:

1. Group A: 25 faculty
2. Group B: 25 faculty
3. Group C: 25 faculty
4. Group P: 24 presidents
5. Group T: 27 trustees

TOTAL: 126 respondents

Data Analysis

This study sought to test three hypotheses concerning the rank order of importance of institutional problems and the assigned level of responsibility for their resolution as perceived by five institutional groups. The data collected from the questionnaire to test these hypotheses were analyzed using the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) and, specifically, using a ONEWAY for data analysis among groups present and future. Where differences were found, the post hoc Scheffe test was used.

Hypotheses

Hypothesis 1. There would be no significant difference in the relative importance of critical problems at present as perceived by groups of trustees, presidents, and faculty.

The data analysis relating to this hypothesis is presented in Table 1 and is displayed to show group means and level of significance for each problem area. Numerical rank ordering of the problems by group is also provided.

As can be seen in the table, there was a statistical difference at the .01 level among the group means in the importance placed on Institutional Acquisition of Financial

TABLE I ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF PROBLEM AREA IMPORTANCE BY GROUP FOR PRESENT

Problem Area	Group A $\bar{x}$.	Group B $\bar{x}$.	Group C $\bar{x}$	Group P $\bar{x}$	Group T $\bar{x}$.	F.	Significance	Rank $\bar{x}$
1. Institutional Acquisition of Financial Resources	2.92(2)	2.79(1)	1.60(1)	1.64(1)	2.40(2)	3.7	.01	1.2(1)
2. Internal Distribution of Financial Resources	4.24(5)	4.72(5)	4.32(4)	5.08(6)	4.92(5.5)	1.4	N.S.	5.5(6)
3. Determination of Institutional Priorities	3.08(3)	3.56(4)	3.16(3)	3.28(3)	3.59(4)	0.8	N.S.	3.2(3)
4. Addition and Deletion of Academic Personnel	5.04(6)	4.88(6)	4.48(6)	4.84(5)	4.92(5.5)	0.5	N.S.	5.3(5)
5. Student Recruitment and Retention	2.64(1)	2.96(2)	2.32(2)	2.44(2)	2.33(1)	0.8	N.S.	1.3(2)
6. Definition of Institutional Government Relationships	6.28(7)	5.80(7)	6.28(7)	6.00(7)	6.25(7)	0.5	N.S.	7(7)
7. Definition of Institutional Purpose-Identity	3.80(4)	3.36(3)	4.72(5)	3.60(4)	3.55(3)	1.5	N.S.	3.4(4)

Rank Order =()

Significance = .05

Resources. While this difference was sufficient to reject the hypothesis, it should be noted that the difference appeared to be in regard to the strength of perception of it being ranked number one in level of importance. A further test of the means indicated the difference was between faculty groups A and B and trustees who perceived the problem slightly less important than the standard faculty group and the presidents. When this problem area was reviewed in relation to the problem area of Student Recruitment and Retention (N.S.), it could be seen that these two areas together were ranked closely as either number one or two in importance by all groups. Similarly, Determination of Institutional Priorities (N.S.) and Definition of Institutional Purpose-Identity (N.S.) were ranked closely in importance by all groups. The least important problem area was Definition of Institutional-Government Relationships (N.S.).

Hypothesis 2. There would be no significant difference in the relative importance of critical problems in the future as perceived by groups of trustees, presidents, and faculty.

The data analysis relating to this hypothesis is presented in Table 2 and is displayed also to show group means and level of significance for each problem area. Numerical rank ordering of problems by group are provided also.

For the most part, the data analysis for relative importance of problem areas in the future as perceived by the five groups resulted in similar findings to those found for the present. The statistical difference among the group means for

TABLE 2 ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF PROBLEM AREA IMPORTANCE BY GROUP FOR PRESENT

Problem Area	Group A $\bar{x}$.	Group B $\bar{x}$.	Group C $\bar{x}$.	Group P $\bar{x}$.	Group T $\bar{x}$.	F.	Significance	Rank $\bar{x}$
1. Institutional Acquisition of Financial Resources	3.25(3)	2.32(1)	1.84(1)	1.88(1)	2.55(2)	3.5	.01	1.3(1.5
2. Internal Distribution of Financial Resources	4.28(5)	4.68(5)	4.48(5)	5.32(6)	4.82(5)	1.7	N.S.	5.1(5)
3. Determination of Institutional Priorities	3.16(2)	3.96(3)	3.24(3)	3.60(4)	3.48(3)	1.2	N.S.	3 (3)
4. Addition and Deletion of Academic Personnel	4.84(6)	4.96(6)	4.72(6)	4.96(5)	5.29(6)	0.6	N.S.	5.4(6)
5. Student Recruitment and Retention	2.60(1)	2.40(2)	2.20(2)	2.16(2)	2.29(1)	0.4	N.S.	1.3(1.5
6. Definition of Institutional Government Relationships	6.28(7)	5.12(7)	6.00(7)	5.48(7)	6.00(7)	1.8	N.S.	7 (7)
7. Definition of Institutional Purpose-Identity	3.60(4)	4.56(4)	4.24(4)	3.48(3)	3.55(4)	1.3	N.S.	3.4(4)

Rank order =()

Significance = .05

Institutional Acquisition of Financial Resources was sufficient to reject the hypothesis (.01). When this problem area was added to Student Recruitment and Retention (N.S.), the two together combined to form a larger composite concern. One important group shift should be noted, however. Group A, the collectivized faculty, dropped Institutional Acquisition of Financial Resources from a rank of two in the present to third rank in the future, replacing it with Determination of Institutional Priorities (N.S.). All other group rankings for these problem areas remained the same. It should be noted further that Internal Distribution of Financial Resources (N.S.) moved up one rank in importance from the present to the future, while Addition and Deletion of Academic Personnel (N.S.) dropped one rank to sixth.

Hypothesis 3. There would be no significant difference in the level of responsibility for problem resolution present and future as perceived by groups of trustees, presidents, and faculty.

The data analysis for this hypothesis was performed as repeated measures analysis of variance with time as the repeated factor and academic groups as the other factor. The results of this analysis are presented in Table 3.

The F-ratios and significance levels reported in Table 3 reflected perceptions by the total population (five groups together) of level of responsibility for problem resolution present to future for trustees, presidents, and faculty. Where differences were found, the data were analyzed by groups to discover the nature of the differences.

TABLE 3

LEVEL OF RESPONSIBILITY FOR PROBLEM RESOLUTION
PRESENT TO FUTURE AS PERCEIVED BY FIVE GROUPS

Problem Areas		F	Significance
1. Institutional Acquisition of Financial Resources			
	Trustees	0.67	N.S.
	Presidents	2.51	<.05
	Faculty	1.25	N.S.
2. Internal Distribution of Financial Resources			
	Trustees	0.46	N.S.
	Presidents	1.77	N.S.
	Faculty	2.66	<.03
3. Determination of Institutional Priorities			
	Trustees	0.63	N.S.
	Presidents	1.34	N.S.
	Faculty	2.43	<.05
4. Addition and Deletion of Academic Personnel			
	Trustees	0.42	N.S.
	Presidents	0.73	N.S.
	Faculty	3.53	<.01
5. Student Recruitment and Retention			
	Trustees	1.80	N.S.
	Presidents	1.94	N.S.
	Faculty	0.34	N.S.
6. Definition of Institutional/Government Relationship			
	Trustees	0.76	N.S.
	Presidents	1.73	N.S.
	Faculty	0.32	N.S.
7. Definition of Institutional Purpose-Identity			
	Trustees	1.64	N.S.
	Presidents	0.67	N.S.
	Faculty	0.35	N.S.

Significance = .05

As can be seen in Table 3, significant differences in the perceived level of problem responsibility within the population occurred in four of the problem areas. This was sufficient to reject the hypothesis.

The first problem area where a significant difference was found was Institutional Acquisition of Financial Resources where the difference in responsibility for presidents was at the .05 level. An inspection of the means for the five groups revealed that the difference was between the faculty and the presidents and trustees generally and among the three faculty groups specifically. The faculty generally saw a higher level of responsibility for resolution of this problem area by presidents in the future with significant differences existing among the three faculty groups as to the particular level of responsibility the presidents should assume. Faculty Group A (collectivized faculty) placed the highest level of responsibility on the presidents, Faculty Group C (composite faculty) the least.

The other three problem areas where significant differences were found were Internal Distribution of Financial Resources (.03), Determination of Institutional Priorities (.05), and Addition and Deletion of Academic Personnel (.01). It should be noted that the three points of difference concerned the amount of responsibility the faculty should have for resolution of these problem areas. An inspection of the means for the five groups in these areas revealed a common pattern. In each case, the faculty generally wished a greater responsibility in the future for these problems than that

perceived by the presidents and trustees, and among the faculty groups there was significant difference as to the amount of responsibility the faculty should have, with Faculty Group A claiming the most and Faculty Group C the least.

In analyzing all four points of significant differences that were found, no difference was found between the president and trustee groups. The differences in each case were between these two groups and the faculty, and among the faculty groups themselves.

CHAPTER IV

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

Review

This study began with the assumption that the small, private liberal arts colleges in this country would be faced with problems in the 1980s which, if not resolved, would lead to the demise of a number of these schools. The problems of the colleges thus formed the problem of the study. What were the problems the colleges were facing and might one rank them in order of importance for institutional survival? Further, was there any consensus among college trustees, presidents, and faculty as to who was presently responsible for the solution of those problems and who should be responsible in the future? Was there any difference in perceptions as to solution responsibility in different settings, for example, between an urban-collectivized and a collegial-rural faculty?

To answer these questions, the study began with a brief survey of the history of small liberal arts colleges. This history culminated in the challenge to traditional campus collegiality posed in the 1970s by inflation, relative rigidity in the faculty job market, decline in endowment income, the demographic prospect of decline in the number of traditional age college students, a growing questioning of the rewards of a liberal arts education, and governance problems induced by

all of the above.

The importance of the study was seen to lie in the pressing need to know:

1. Was there common agreement among college constituencies as to the existence and nature of the problems to be faced?

2. Were there common perceptions as to who was responsible for their solution?

If there was no common agreement as to the reality and relative importance of the problems, or if there was disageement over who should be attacking them, the chances for survival of small private higher education were minimal. One would hardly conceive of a more important issue than the status of small college governance and problem perceptions at the beginning of a new decade. The underlying assumptions of the study were thus twofold:

1. One cannot solve problems if they are not defined and accepted as real

2. One cannot solve problems if the problem-solving apparatus is divided and weak

Since the heart of the study involved the health and efficiency of the problem-solving apparatus, a brief examination was made of the theories of college governance, defined by Baldridge as: (1) bureaucratic, (2) collegial, and (3) political. It was concluded that none of these theories is universally accepted as the only proper one, and that most colleges displayed a mixture of the three types. Thus, the background material for the study was concluded.

In an attempt to delineate the problems faced by the small liberal arts colleges, a literature survey was undertaken which began with an examination of about one hundred sources from which thirty sources were examined in detail because of their currency, specificity of discussion, and authoritativeness. Learning resources were drawn from the libraries of the University of Iowa, University of Arkansas, and University of Dubuque. The following problems were identified:

1. The acquisition and allocation of financial resources
2. Governance/management
3. Institutional identity-purpose
4. Program/curriculum
5. Student recruitment/retention
6. Planning
7. Government regulation of the private sector

One of these problems, governance/management, was not included in the survey research instrument which was later developed since the entire study was concerned with governance/management difficulties in dealing with the other six problems.

As indicated above, a survey research instrument was drawn up to test problem identification and problem-solving responsibility. The questionnaire was sent to some thirty colleges with student populations of less than 2,000. All were private, church-related liberal arts colleges. The presidents and one trustee from each college were surveyed,

plus one senior faculty member. In the case of two colleges, one urban-collectivized and one rural-collegial, the entire faculties were surveyed. Thus, College A was compared with College B against C or all the other colleges; in other words, as a standard against which to measure A and B. Presidents were compared with presidents and trustees with trustees and each with the other. Faculties also were measured against the other two categories. The questionnaire consisted of three points: (1) rank the importance of the following problems (identified in the literature survey), both for the present and the future; (2) assign levels of responsibility for solving these problems in the present and the future to trustees, presidents, and faculty; and (3) supply demographic information (faculty only). The survey was pre-tested for reliability.

The hypothesis of the study was that there would be no significant difference in the ranking of problems, present and future, and that there would be no significant difference in the perceived level of responsibility for problem resolution, present and future, on the part of presidents, trustees, and faculty. The third chapter of the study, which dealt with procedure as described above, closed with a presentation of the data drawn from the survey instrument.

Findings

This study sought to determine whether groups of faculty, presidents, and trustees from an urban-collectivized liberal arts college, a rural-collegial liberal arts college, and a composite college drawn from twenty-five institutions would rank order selected problem areas differently present

future, and would perceive different levels of responsibility for resolution of these problems present and future for the three groups. The assumption was that differences, if found, could be construed to suggest possible governance discord for institutions as they sought to respond to the identified problems in the immediate and continuing future. The study was constructed to test three hypotheses set in null fashion, two reflecting problem rankings present and future, and one reflecting problem resolution responsibility present and future. Based on the data analysis presented in Chapter III, the three hypotheses were rejected. Significant differences were found among the research groups studied. The major findings were as follows:

1. Significant difference was found among the five groups studied in regard to the rank order of the seven problem areas presently. This difference, however, was found within one area, Acquisition of Financial Resources, where the presidents and the composite faculty viewed it more strongly as problem number one than did the other groups, particularly the collectivized faculty group.

2. Basically, the same results were found in regard to the rank order of the seven problem areas in the future.

3. In reviewing the rank ordering of the problem areas present and future by the five groups, several patterns emerged. By averaging the group ranks across each problem area, Acquisition of Financial Resources and Student Recruitment and Retention were found to be very close together in rank order. These two problem areas representing primary resources needed

by an institution to function were ranked either first or second by all groups, except for the collectivized faculty group which ranked Acquisition of Financial Resources third for the future.

A second pattern that could be discerned was the tendency for all groups to rank Determination of Institutional Priorities and Definition of Institutional Purpose-Identity quite closely in order as ranks three and four, respectively, both in the present and the future.

Of some importance was the tendency for all groups to place Internal Distribution of Financial Resources and Addition and Deletion of Academic Personnel toward the bottom in rank order of importance. These two problem areas reflecting internal usage of institutional resources were not viewed with the same level of seriousness as the acquisition of institutional resources and the setting of institutional purpose and priorities. This finding was common for all groups and for the two institutions representing two different governance arrangements.

4. The greatest difference found among the five groups studied as to their perceptions of institutional problems was in the level of responsibility that faculty, presidents, and trustees should have, present and future, for the resolution of these problems. While not a great deal of difference was found among the groups in their rank ordering of the problems, considerably more difference was found in regard to who should resolve them. Significant differences were found in four of the seven problem areas. These problem areas were Institutional

Acquisition of Financial Resources, Internal Distribution of Financial Resources, Determination of Institutional Priorities, and Addition and Deletion of Academic Personnel. In all cases, the source of the difference in perceived levels of responsibility for these problems was found among the three faculty groups. The faculty perceived an increased responsibility level for the presidents in the future for acquiring financial resources, while at the same time the faculty wished greater responsibility in the future for distributing financial resources, setting institutional priorities, and for control over academic personnel. In each case, the collectivized faculty's view was most extreme of the three faculty groups with the composite faculty the least.

There was no significant difference between presidents and trustees in regard to problem responsibility levels, present and future.

5. One purpose of this study was to determine if a faculty group from a rural-collegial campus would perceive problems differently from a faculty group from an urban-collectivized campus. The assumption was that if there was a difference, it could possibly be attributed to the different governance configurations of the two campuses. To help look at this question, a standard faculty group was created, made up of one faculty member from each of twenty-five different institutions. The findings of this study revealed that the three faculty groups were significantly different in their views in most areas where differences were found. Whether these differences were a function of the decision-making

structure within which these groups work or were attributable to other causes, this study could not determine. The nature of these differences will have to wait for further research.

6. In general, this study found that groups of faculty, presidents, and trustees differed significantly in regard to certain aspects of major problems facing institutions at present and in the future. The nature of these differences suggest potential discord for future institutional decision-making behavior.

Discussion

Having reviewed the data, the question naturally arises: What does it all mean? The quantitative dimensions of this study do not lend themselves to the development of firm conclusions. The conclusions are, in essence, the findings listed above. It is imperative, nevertheless, that the results of this study and their implications for the administration of private liberal arts colleges be discussed.

There is a sense in which each college or university is more than the sum total of its constituencies, its governance structure, and the state of its fiscal health. Small, private liberal arts colleges, in particular, represent a collective psychology unique to the institution in question. Groups of small colleges, for example, the United Presbyterian Colleges involved in this study, despite their differences, share a collective psychology, a common orientation to life and learning. As such, they represent a viable alternative to the philosophical, psychological mix of a large state

university. They make possible a pluralism within the American educational environment which de Tocqueville eloquently supported in his nineteenth-century essay on American life. Thus, the alternative to public higher education is more than a private sector, free of the intrusion of governors and state legislatures, more than a refuge for political and religious conservatives, though this is sometimes the case. There is in the collective psychology of the small private college a healthy elitism of aspirations and values which has made these institutions' leaders in the struggle for social justice and humane concerns in whose path the state-supported institutions have slowly followed.

It is therefore imperative that the better of these private liberal arts colleges survive the closing of this century. To survive, however, the constituencies of these colleges must ever be mindful of the problems confronting them as discussed in Chapter II of this study. Two of the seven problems, the acquisition of funds and students, seem of supreme importance, but they are followed closely by two others, the definition of institutional purpose and the determination of institutional priorities. Without the solution of the latter, the former may become insoluble.

The basic assumption of this study has been that in facing these critical problems for survival, it is absolutely vital that the college community achieve workable consensus on the relative importance of the various problems in the present and in the future, as well as agreement on the levels of responsibility for their solution to be assumed by each

college constituency, i.e., trustees, administrators, and faculty, again both in the present and in the future. It is, therefore, disconcerting to find that in the institutions studied, significant differences occurred with regard to the level of responsibility for problem resolution among the groups in regard to certain problems. While there were differences among the three faculty groups surveyed, an even sharper demarcation existed between all the faculties and the administrator-trustee groups.

Although the study was delineated to two institutional settings compared to several dozen others, the findings may be perceived as being generalizable to private liberal arts colleges as a whole. Furthermore, if this generalization is not too broadly conceived, then it can be suggested that there may be a problem for the private colleges of much higher magnitude than those covered in the research instrument. That problem is basically a governance problem; it is the problem of debilitating discord over problem priorities and degrees of responsibility for their solution.

In an earlier chapter of the study, attention was paid to several college governance theories--theories meant to explicate existing practices on college campuses. If the greatest single problem facing the small, private college is discord over what needs to be done first and who should do it, then which of these theories offers the best possible solution? The conclusion drawn in the earlier chapter was that none of the three theories exists in pure form on any campus. The further conclusion made here is that none of the theories taken

in and of themselves can solve the discord arising from the differences detected in this study. If faculties desire a larger role in determining the allocation of funds, for example, a totally bureaucratic method of handling this problem will only lend to further discord. As for the collegial theory, this study would seem to indicate that the necessary degree of collegiality may be lacking for the theory to be applicable. Finally, the political theory would seem to imply the continued eixstence of discord and not much hope for the unity essential to the survival of small private colleges.

Elsewhere in this study, Martin indicated that strong central management of colleges is required to deal with the problems facing the private colleges in the 1980s. Can there be strong central management that is not totally bureaucratic, that achieves the fruit of collegial governance without succumbing to the endless committee meetings and political struggles that seem to accompany them? Is there a governance model that can deal successfully with the problem raised by disagreement over problem priorities and levels of responsibility for their solution? This is an important question arising out of this study. Unless it is solved, the apparent discord could result in fatal institutional paralysis in at least some private liberal arts colleges.

It is strongly suggested that this study, admittedly limited in scope, be replicated in other institutional settings to determine if the discord that seems to exist is indeed a reality. Entire faculties of more than two institutions might

be researched. Larger private colleges might be included in a subsequent study. Perhaps a different methodological approach might be used. Inquiry could also be made into what extent these problems obtain on community college campuses and those of state universities. A further refinement of the demographic information supplied by the faculty might be called for to discover the degree to which rank, for example, determines the assignment of problem priorities and responsibility levels. What is found in these chapters may be only a beginning in the exploration of the relation between how a college functions and the solution of the problems it faces in the 1980s and beyond.

APPENDIX A

ACADEMIC DECISION-MAKING RESPONSIBILITY SURVEY

I. PROBLEM AREAS RANKED BY IMPORTANCE

The following have been identified as problem areas for small, private liberal arts colleges in the 1980s. From your viewpoint, rank them in order of importance, one through seven; first, as you view them for the present and then as you view them for the future.

	Present	Future
Institutional Acquisition of Financial Resources	_____	_____
Internal Distribution of Financial Resources	_____	_____
Determination of Institutional Priorities	_____	_____
Addition and Deletion of Academic Personnel	_____	_____
Student Recruitment and Retention	_____	_____
Definition of Institutional/ Government Relationships	_____	_____
Definition of Institutional Purpose-Identity	_____	_____

II. PROBLEM AREAS BY GROUP RESPONSIBILITY

Please indicate how you view faculty, administration, and trustee responsibility for decision making in the problem areas listed below at present and in the future, using the following scale:

1 = No responsibility
2 = Low responsibility
3 = Moderate responsibility
4 = High responsibility
5 = Complete responsibility

Please circle the appropriate number, present and future.

		Present	Future
A.	Institutional Acquisition of Financial Resources		
	Trustees	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5
	Administration	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5
	Faculty	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5
B.	Internal Distribution of Financial Resources		
	Trustees	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5
	Administration	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5
	Faculty	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5
C.	Determination of Institutional Priorities		
	Trustees	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5
	Administration	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5
	Faculty	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5
D.	Addition and Deletion of Academic Personnel		
	Trustees	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5
	Administration	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5
	Faculty	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5
E.	Student Recruitment and Retention		
	Trustees	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5
	Administration	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5
	Faculty	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5
F.	Definition of Institutional-Government Relationships		
	Trustees	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5
	Administration	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5
	Faculty	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5

	Present	Future
G. Definition of Institutional Purpose-Identity		
Trustees	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5
Administration	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5
Faculty	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5

III. BACKGROUND DATA

A. Academic Rank

___ Professor

___ Associate

___ Assistant

___ Instructor

___ Other

B. Number of Years at Present Institution

___ Less than 5 years

___ Less than 10 years

___ Less than 15 years

___ Over 15 years

C. Academic Discipline

___ Natural Science

___ Social Science

___ Humanities

___ Other

D. Highest Earned Degree

___ Bachelor's

___ Master's

___ Doctorate

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Andrew, Loyd D., and Freedman, Burton D. A Study of the Causes for the Demise of Certain Small Liberal Arts Colleges in the United States. ERIC ED 125 486. Blacksburg: Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University, 1976.

Astin, Alexander W., and Calvin B. T. Lee. The Invisible Colleges. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1972.

Baldridge, J. Victor, ed. Academic Governance. Berkeley: McCutcheon Publishing Corp., 1971.

Carnegie Commission on Higher Education. Sponsored Research of the Carnegie Commission on Higher Education. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1975.

Carnegie Council for the Advancement of Teaching. More Than Survival. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc., 1975.

Chamberlain, Philip C., and Shilling, Roy B., Jr. "Private Liberal Arts Colleges and Their Changing Purposes." Bulletin of the School of Education, Indiana University 43 (May 1967):1-27.

Childers, Marie E. "Academic Decision Making Structures." Ph.D. dissertation, Indiana University, 1964.

Cleary, Robert E. "Trustee-President Authority Relations." Educational Record 60 (Spring 1979):146-57.

Corson, John J. Governance of Colleges and Universities. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1960.

Goldwin, Robert A. Private Higher Education: The Job Ahead. ERIC ED 126 828. Rockford, Ill.: American Association of Presidents of Independent Colleges and Universities, 1975.

Hodgkinson, Harold L. Institutions in Transition. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1971.

Hodgkinson, Harold L., and Bloy, Myron B., eds. Identity Crisis in Higher Education. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc., 1971.

Jackson, Robert L. "The First Amendment: Refuge for Colleges?" Chronicle of Higher Education, June 28, 1976, p. 10.

Jellema, William W., ed. Efficient College Management. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc., 1972.

_____. Institutional Priorities and Management Objectives. Washington, D.C.: American Association of Colleges, 1971.

Jenny, Hans H., and Wynne, G. Richard. The Turning Point: A Study of Income and Expenditure Growth and Distribution of 48 Private Four-Year Colleges, 1960-1970. ERIC ED 065 019. Wooster, Mass.: College of Wooster, 1972.

Johnson, Eldon. From Riot to Reason. Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1971.

Jonsen, Richard W. Small Liberal Arts Colleges: Diversity at the Crossroads. ERIC ED 154 680. Washington, D.C.: George Washington University, 1978.

Keaton, Morris. Shared Authority on Campus. Washington, D.C.: American Association for Higher Education, 1971.

Kershaw, Joseph A. The Very Small College: A Report to the Ford Foundation. New York: The Ford Foundation, 1976.

McGee, Reece. Academic Janus. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc., 1971.

Millett, John D. The Academic Community: An Essay on Organization. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1962.

Minter, W. John, and Bowen, Howard R. Independent Higher Education, Fourth Annual Report on Financial and Educational Trends in the Independent Sector of American Higher Education. ERIC ED 158 653. Washington, D.C.: National Association of Independent Colleges and Universities, 1978.

Platt, Gerald M., and Parsons, Talcott. "Decision-Making in the Academic System: Influence and Power Exchange," pp. 40-49. In The State of the University, Authority and Change. Edited by Carol E. Krytbosch and Sheldon E. Messinger. Beverly Hills, Calif.: Sage Publications, 1968.

Richardson, Richard C., Jr. "Governance Theory: A Comparison of Approaches." Journal of Higher Education 45 (May 1974):344-54.

Rourke, Francis E., and Brooks, Glenn E. The Managerial Revolution in Higher Education. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press, 1966.

Schulman, Carol H. Private Colleges, Present Conditions and Future Prospects. ERIC ED 098 888. Washington, D.C.: George Washington University, 1974.

Smith, Bardwell L. The Tenure Debate. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc., 1973.

Society for College and University Planning. The Past, Present and Future of American Higher Education. Washington, D.C.: Society for College and University Planning, 1978.

Stroup, Herbert. Bureaucracy in Higher Education. New York: The Free Press, 1966.

Trivett, David A. The Vital Small College. ERIC ED 114 004. Washington, D.C.: George Washington University, 1975.

Winkler, Karen J. "Proliferating Federal Regulations: Is Government Now 'The Enemy'?" Chronicle of Higher Education, December 13, 1976, p. 3.

Wynn, G. Richard. At the Crossroads: A Report on the Financial Condition of 48 Liberal Arts Colleges Previously Studied in "The Golden Years, The Turning Point." ERIC ED 092 049. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan, 1974.

VITA

John Frederick BURHORN
603 Buchanan Street
Clarksville, Arkansas 72830

Telephones:
501/754-3801 Residence
501/754-2788 Business

Educational Background

Illinois College, Jacksonville, Illinois	1944-48	B.A.
University of Chicago, Chicago, Illinois	1948-49	
McCormick Theological Seminary, Chicago, Illinois	1950-53	M.Div.
University of Illinois, Urbana, Illinois	1960-61	M.A.
Illinois College, Jacksonville, Illinois	1979	L.H.D.

Teaching Background

Instructor, Midway School for Children (private elementary)	1944
Private Tutor for the Private Teacher's Association of Chicago (summers)	1945-48
Substitute Teacher, University of Chicago Orthogenic School	1948
Student Assistant in History, Illinois College	1944-47
Student Assistant in French, Illinois College	1948
Associate Professor of Religion, Millikin University	1956-61
Associate Professor of Social Studies, University of Dubuque	1968-79

Administrative Background

Dean of Chapel and Chairman of the Department of Religion, Millikin University, Decatur, Illinois	1956-61
Chairman, Department of Political Science, University of Dubuque, Dubuque, Iowa	1968-70
Assistant Dean of the College and Director of the Summer School, University of Dubuque	1970-73
Dean of the Faculty, University of Dubuque	1974-75
Academic Dean, University of Dubuque	1975-79
President, College of the Ozarks, Clarksville, Arkansas	1979-

Academic Honors

Illinois College
  Rammelkamp Scholarship, Phi Beta Kappa (in course), Who's Who in American Colleges and Universities
McCormick Theological Seminary
  Lane Scholarship, Preserved Smith Scholarship, John V. Farwell Prize in Homiletics
Danforth Teacher Study Grant, 1960-61

Non-Teaching Experience

Minister, First Presbyterian Church, Anna, Illinois	1953-56
Senior Minister, First Presbyterian Church, Macomb, Illinois	1961-68

Memberships

Member, Advisory Board, Walden University, Institute for Advanced Studies, Naples, Florida
Moderator, the former United Presbyterian USA, Synod of Illinois, 1966-67
Moderator, the former Mattoon Presbytery UPUSA, 1960-61
Former Vice President, Illinois Presbyterian Home, Springfield, Illinois, 1950s